

*Docket No. 1759.073***REMARKS**

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections in the Office Action dated July 10, 2003, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Entry of these amendments, reconsideration, and allowance of all claims pending herein is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 are now pending and under consideration.

Abstract Objection:

The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because the Abstract is not in a single paragraph form and the term "its" should be changed to "an". The Abstract has been amended and is believed to overcome this objection.

Claim Objections:

Claim 1 stands objected to because the phrase "for gliding for downhill skiing" should be changed to "for gliding downhill skiing". It is respectfully submitted that "downhill skiing" refers to the sport of downhill skiing and therefore a board for gliding for use in such a sport is intended to be recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that "a board for gliding for downhill skiing" refers to a board for use in gliding during downhill skiing. Therefore, the recitation in claim 1 is believed to be clear and to overcome this objection.

Claim 4 stands objected to because the term "its length" should be changed to "a length of the gliding board". This amendment has been made per the suggestion in the Office Action and this objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Commier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,943).

Claims 1 recites a board for downhill skiing which has an underfoot zone. The underfoot zone includes a lower gliding surface, a topsheet, and lateral faces. The lower gliding surface includes a sole plate bordered by metal edges. The topsheet is substantially parallel to the lower gliding surface, on either side of a center longitudinal plane of the board. The lateral faces extend

Docket No. 1759.073

between the metal edges and the topsheet and include recesses located below the plane of the topsheet and which open out into the topsheet. Bases of the recesses form a slope inclined longitudinally relative to the lower gliding surface and the top sheet.

Commier et al. discloses a ski having a raised median rib bordered by two lowered lateral portions. The lateral portions are alleged in the Office Action to be recesses. As described in column 4, lines 30-40, the upper surfaces 81 and 91 of lateral portions 8 and 9 are substantially planar. The flat nature of the lateral surfaces allows the longitudinal position of the binding to be adjusted in accordance with the size of the boot of the user. Thus, the lateral portions in the underfoot zone of such a ski could not be inclined longitudinally relative to the ski because this would prevent the binding from being mounted thereto because a front and rear portion of a binding must be in a same plane to allow a boot of a user to be received therein. Accordingly, the lateral portions must be substantially planar in an area under a boot of a user, as described in the referenced lines of column 4. In contrast, claim 1 recites recesses that are inclined longitudinally relative to a lower gliding surface and top sheet of a board for downhill skiing. Because the lateral surfaces disclosed in Commier et al. must be planar in an underfoot zone of a ski to allow a binding to be mounted thereto, Commier et al. cannot identically disclose a board for gliding for downhill skiing which includes recesses in an underfoot zone which are inclined longitudinally relative to a lower gliding surface and a topsheet of a board for gliding for downhill skiing.

Further, a review of the figures in Commier et al. discloses various slopes of the interface (e.g., connecting portion 82) between the median rib portion and the lateral portions in a transverse direction of the ski. However, there is no disclosure of recesses in an underfoot zone, which are inclined longitudinally, i.e., in the lengthwise direction of the ski, relative to a lower gliding surface and a topsheet of a board for downhill skiing.

Also, even if the lateral portions were considered to be recesses, the only portion thereof which may be considered to be inclined longitudinally is outside of an underfoot zone of the ski. Specifically, in FIG. 2, between the arrow points of numeral 1 and numeral 6, an inclined portion of the lateral portion intersects with the front portion of the ski. Such inclination of the lateral portion between the arrows of numeral 1 and numeral 6 on FIG. 2, along with the corresponding

Docket No. 1759.073

inclination at the rear of the ski, are outside of an underfoot zone of such ski. Thus, there is no disclosure of recesses of a ski which are inclined in an underfoot zone as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because the features of claim 1 are not identically disclosed in Commier et al., this claim cannot be anticipated thereby. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable along with the dependent claims which are believed to be allowable for the same reasons and for their own additional features.


Also, the references indicated in the Office Action as being pertinent, but which were not relied upon, have been reviewed and the claims of the present application are believed to be allowable over these references.

*Docket No. 1759.073***CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 44,589

OFFICIAL

Dated: October 7, 2003

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI, P.C.

5 Columbia Circle

Albany, New York 12203

Telephone: (518) 452-5600

Facsimile: (518) 452-5579

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 07 2003

Attachments

BEST AVAILABLE COPY